



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,701	03/30/2001	Kenneth W. Aull	15-0225	7427

7590 03/07/2005

Christopher P. Harris
Tarolli, Sundheim, Covell & Tummino LLP
526 Superior Avenue
Suite 1111
Cleveland, OH 44114-1400

EXAMINER

SCHUBERT, KEVIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/823,701

Applicant(s)

AULL, KENNETH W.

Examiner

Kevin Schubert

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2137

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-16 have been reconsidered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

10

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

15

Claims 1-2,5-6,9-10, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yacobi, U.S. Patent No. 5,878,138.

As per claims 1,5,9, and 13, the applicant describes a method of preventing ID spoofing of public key infrastructure system in an enterprise comprising the following limitations which are met by Yacobi:

20

a) allowing a user to access a registration server (Col 8, line 50 to Col 9, line 23);

b) upon the registration server receiving identification information from the user and also receiving a request by the user for a new signature certificate, the registration server querying a directory containing reference information of users of the enterprise to obtain information regarding the identified user (Col 8, line 50 to Col 9, line 23);

25

c) and upon the registration server receiving information from the directory indicating that the identified user already possesses a signature certificate, the registration server informing the user that a new signature certificate will not be issued until the old signature certificate has been revoked, thereby preventing an unauthorized user from ID spoofing to obtain a valid signature certificate (Col 8, line 50 to Col 9, line 23);

Art Unit: 2137

d) and maintaining a one-to-one correspondence between users of the enterprise and signature certificates (Col 13, lines 1-2);

As per claims 2,6,10, and 14, the applicant limits the method of claim 1, which is met by Yacobi (see above), with the following limitations which are also met by Yacobi:

Further comprising providing user identifiers and their corresponding digital signature certificates in said directory (Yacobi: Col 9, lines 10-16)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3,7,11, and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacobi in view of Zhou.

As per claims 3,7,11, and 15, the applicant limits independent claims 1,5,9, and 13 which are met by Yacobi (see above), with the following limitation which is met by Zhou:

further comprising providing an authoritative database including user identifiers, wherein the directory is updated from the authoritative database.

Yacobi discloses all the limitations of the independent claims. However, Yacobi fails to disclose the use of an authoritative database.

Zhou discloses the benefit of using directory integration with an authoritative database of user identifiers which he calls a metadirectory. In the second paragraph Zhou writes, "Directory integration lets network administrators manage directory information from one directory and

Art Unit: 2137

automate the process of changing information in multiple directories. In the short run, directory integration lowers the cost of directory management because it reduces human involvement in directory management. A comprehensive directory-integration system often requires an enterprise directory to store and unify directory information in a central repository, or
5 metadirectory. In the long run, you can incorporate into a metadirectory new network services—for example, ... public key infrastructure (PKI), to manage digital certificates for e-commerce”.

An authoritative database including user identifiers would be an obvious improvement in Yacobi's system because it would allow one centrally managed database to update various bank sites. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was
10 filed to combine the ideas of Zhou with the ideas of Yacobi because one would have motivation to use an authoritative database to better manage digital certificates as Zhou discloses.

Claims 4,8,12, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacobi in view of Fischer, U.S. Patent No. 5,214,702.

15 As per claims 4,8,12, and 16, the applicant limits the method of claims 1 (etc), which are met by Yacobi (see above), with the following limitation which is met by Fischer:

Further comprising providing a personal revocation authority to revoke a user's previous signature certificate, the personal revocation authority being chosen so as to personally recognize
20 a user (Col 13, lines 46-47);

Yacobi discloses all the limitations of independent claims 1,5,9, and 13. However, Yacobi fails to disclose a person who is a revocation authority in charge of personally recognizing users.

Fischer discloses the idea that a “certifier may empower another person to cancel other
25 certificates which the certifier has produced” (Col 13, lines 46-47). Fischer discloses the idea that a person, not a computer, can revoke certificates which is absent from Yacobi. Since a person is the revocation authority, he can personally recognize a user.

Art Unit: 2137

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was filed to combine the ideas of Fischer with those of Yacobi and incorporate the idea of a personal revocation authority to add another element of security into Yacobi's system through personally being able to identify users to prevent ID spoofing.

5

Remarks to Applicant

As per claims 1,5,9, and 13, the issue of the one-to-one correspondence between users and certificates has been fixed by Yacobi, who discloses a system where a user has exactly one certificate at any one time (Col 13, lines 1-2). Yacobi also discloses all the limitations of claims 1,5,9, and 13, so it is not necessary to combine Vaeth.

10

As per claims 4,8,12, and 16, the issue of a personal revocation authority being a person and not a computer has been fixed by Fischer in the rejection above.

15

Conclusion

As to the rejection of claims 1-16 in the last office action, the applicant's remarks have been fully considered and deemed persuasive. Therefore the rejection has been withdrawn.

20

However, upon further consideration, a new grounds of rejection is made with Yacobi for the reasons given above.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

25

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the

Art Unit: 2137

date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Schubert whose telephone number is (571) 272-4239. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

10 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

15 applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER